

Scott A. Lloyd et al.  
Ser. No. 10/272,922  
Page 5 of 7

### REMARKS

Claims 106 and 108 are canceled by this amendment, thereby obviating the Examiner's objections to them based on 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 103 has been amended to change "tee-time transactions" to "tee-time requests" in order to be consistent with the terminology used in the parent claim 109. Finally, the Examiner's statement that there is no antecedent basis for "said tee-time requests" in lines 9 and 12 of claim 109 is believed to be erroneous, inasmuch as tee-time requests are previously set forth in line 6 of claim 109 to provide antecedent basis.

On the merits, claim 109 is the only independent claim in the application and has been amended in a manner to more particularly point out the patentable aspects of the invention. In particular, it is pointed out that the interface module is recited as being arranged to accept a plurality of the tee-time requests concurrently from a user interface module and to concurrently process plural tee-time requests made by that user interface module to a plurality of different and disparate golf course reservation systems. This type of system is nowhere found in the prior art.

First of all, it is clear that the Germain and Hunt patents both teach systems in which interaction can occur with only one golf course at a time. In the Germain patent, this is evident from Fig. 8 which depicts a time loop from box 142, 150 and 152. Similarly, Fig. 5 of the Hunt patent depicts a time loop from box 64, 66, 68 and 70. Consequently, it is evident that both of these prior art references can interact with only one golf course at a time and that interactions with different courses must occur serially, not concurrently. The present invention, as set forth in amended claim 109, expressly recites that a plurality of tee-time requests made by a single user to a plurality of different and geographically diverse golf courses can be processed concurrently.

KC-1291574-1

Scott A. Lloyd et al.  
Ser. No. 10/272,922  
Page 6 of 7

This difference alone is clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. It is stated succinctly in the specification toward the center of page 4, which states that the "seamless user/service reservation network allows the user to issue multiple concurrent transactions to multiple vendor [golf course] reservation systems within a single communication." The invention of amended claim 109 does that, and the prior art does not.

Additionally, neither the Germain nor Hunt patent teaches a distributed system in which there are a plurality of geographically diverse individual golf course reservation systems. The Germain patent teaches at column 5, lines 9-41 that it contemplates a single, centralized reservation system that supports different golf courses, in contrast to the present invention which is applicable to a plurality of different and disparate golf course reservation systems situated at different locations and each with its own system – not a central system for all of the golf courses. Thus, Germain does not teach a plurality of individual golf course reservation systems.

Neither does Hunt. Hunt repeatedly speaks only of a single computer reservation system. Examples are found in column 5, lines 22, 29, 32, 35, 41, 53 and column 6, lines 1, 14, 23, 25, 32, 42, 45, 50, 53, and 56, as well as in column 7, lines 5 and 16. Thus, Hunt clearly teaches a single "system" rather than a plurality of distributed systems.

For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 109 is clearly allowable. Neither Hunt nor Germain allows for concurrent real time interaction with disparate golf course reservation systems situated at diverse geographical locations. Only the present invention teaches this, and the invention is thus clearly entitled to patent protection.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully asked to enter this amendment because it clearly places the application in condition for allowance.

Scott A. Lloyd et al.  
Ser. No. 10/272,922  
Page 7 of 7

Additionally submitted for consideration of the Examiner is the accompanying Appendix 1 which is a document created by one of the inventors indicating specifically issue by issue how the present invention is completely different from what is taught by the Germain and Hunt patents. In the event that the Examiner is willing to entertain a personal interview with the inventor and his attorney, it is proposed that Appendix 1 be discussed at such interview in addition to whatever other issues may be subject to discussion.

If any issue regarding the allowability of any of the pending claims in the present application could be readily resolved, or if other action could be taken to further advance this application such as an Examiner's amendment, or if the Examiner should have any questions regarding the present amendment, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner please telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney in this regard.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard R. Johnson  
Reg. No. 27,452  
Blackwell Sanders Peper Martin LLP  
4801 Main St., Suite 1000  
Kansas City, MO 64112  
816-983-8000  
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT